

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

TRACY ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

13-cv-561-wmc

CAPT. OLSON, SGT. DAHLKE
and OFFICER LEVEY,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Tracy Anderson is proceeding in this case on his claims that defendants Olson, Dahlke and Levey violated his rights under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment and under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. On October 28, 2013, Anderson filed a document titled “Motion for Summary Judgment,” which this court denied on October 29, 2013 because Anderson’s case had not yet been screened. Now, Anderson has filed a motion for reconsideration of the October 29, 2013 order, because he has now been granted leave to proceed. (Dkt. # 18). However, even now that Anderson’s complaint has made it past the screening stage, his motion fails to comply with this court’s summary judgment procedures, a copy of which was provided to the parties with the preliminary pretrial conference order in this case dated March 20, 2014. Accordingly, Anderson’s motion will be denied at this time. *Bordelon v. Chicago School Reform Board of Trustees*, 233 F.3d 524, 527 (7th Cir. 2000) (district court can require “strict compliance” with local rules governing summary judgment).

If Anderson wishes, he may redraft his motion, along with a brief in support and proposed findings of fact in a manner consistent with the court’s procedures. In addition, to be admissible as evidence, any exhibits Anderson submits must be authenticated. This

means they must be attached to an affidavit in which a person who has personal knowledge of the exhibits declares under penalty of perjury or swears under oath that the exhibits are true and correct copies of the documents they appear to be. An extra copy of the court's summary judgment procedures will be enclosed with this order.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Tracy Anderson's motion for reconsideration of this court's October 29, 2013 order is DENIED without prejudice to his refiling his motion in accordance with the procedures that are outlined in the pretrial conference order.

Entered this 2nd day of April, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY
District Judge